

appropriate forum before the FCC could implement any changes to those rules. My amendment, therefore, would have delayed until the end of the year the implementation of any proposed changes to the rules addressed in media cross-ownership and concentration.

I know the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, shares many of my concerns; and I know he also had concerns about the amendment I was considering because he feared it would tie the hands of the Commission to respond to any court order challenging the current rules, if there is such a court order, during the fiscal year.

So I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman. Knowing of the gentleman's concerns regarding the issue of diversity in the media and maintaining the voice of local broadcasting, I would urge him to keep this issue at the front of the debate on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and I would ask the gentleman one question: Can he tell us if the authorizing committee intends to hold hearings on the issue of media ownership?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to commend the gentleman for his position.

Second of all, I want to thank him for yielding.

Third of all, I want to tell the gentleman that I strongly agree with him. I assure the gentleman that I share his concerns about excessive concentration of ownership in media markets. In fact, I think there is too much concentration at this time. In fact, I just recently wrote the chairman of the FCC, as the gentleman knows, and expressed my strong belief that the current broadcast ownership cap should be retained and that the public interest requires that that be done. However, I also believe that the amendment originally proposed by my friend might have had some unintended consequences; and I want to thank him for deciding not to offer it today.

I will assure the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) that I will work with him in all kind of ways and on all occasions to try and see to it that his view and my view prevail on the matter of increasing concentration in the media.

There are several court cases pending that many believe will remand certain media ownership rules back to the FCC for further consideration and revision. Unless and until the FCC acts pursuant to a court order, there would be no ownership limitations in place if the amendment carried. That is an outcome that I believe neither of us would like to see.

I will assure the gentleman from Wisconsin that I will continue to work within the legislative committee. It will be my intent to work with my good friend from Wisconsin to assure

that existing constraints on excessive media concentration are maintained. To that end, I am going to be requesting the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce to hold hearings on that topic so that we can make better informed judgment as to how we might best protect the American public from the very real dangers that media concentration and media ownership concentration issues present.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I want to commend him for what he has had to say today, and I wish to say to him again, I agree with him.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman. Let me simply say that I think that is a very helpful comment from him.

I think Members need to understand that we are in danger of seeing news outlets in this country virtually homogenized. We are in danger of seeing many local voices stilled by these constant mergers and mega-mergers between media corporations. We need a diversity of media expression in this country, and I hope that the FCC does not contribute to the exact opposite, as I fear they may be planning, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. REYNOLDS) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2500) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### FURTHER LIMITATION ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2500, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 2500 in the Committee of the Whole, pursuant to House Resolution 192 and the order of the House of July 17, 2001, each amendment shall not be subject to amendment (except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, or a designee, each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of further debate on any pending amendment); amendments numbered 14, 26 shall be debatable only for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; amendments numbered 3, 30, 6, 7, shall be debatable only for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and, last-

ly, amendment numbered 12 shall be debatable only for 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, reserving my right to object, and I will not object, but I just wanted to know, does our agreement now leave, to the gentleman's understanding, any amendments that are not covered by time limits?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, there are just a couple that are not.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, do we know exactly how many?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I do not know. We will try to find out.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 192 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2500.

□ 1712

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2500) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, the bill was open for amendment from page 108, line 17, through page 108, line 22.

Pursuant to the further order of the House, each amendment shall not be subject to amendment (except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, or a designee, may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of further debate on any pending amendment); amendments numbered 14, 26 shall be debatable only for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent; amendments numbered 3, 30, 6 and 7 shall be debatable only for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent; and amendment numbered 12 shall be debatable only for 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent.